

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 6, 2002

I. Call to Order.

CHAIR ROBERT WILCOX – Let us begin. I urge you to please remind your colleagues who are not here but in your department or elsewhere (and I will give them the same reminder) that we can be in and out of here pretty quickly. Today, there is not a lot of business. But there are some things that we have to do as a Senate, and one of them is approve curriculum changes, and the College of Criminal Justice/Department of Criminal Justice has a major curriculum change that they need approved. Until we get a quorum we cannot do that. So, if you would, urge people to please come and if we can get them in out in a hurry, we will do that. But we need to be here so we can take care of business. If we cannot get a quorum, we will have to put those things off until another month.

You have in front of you the minutes of the last meeting. I suppose until we get a quorum, or I am comfortable we have one close, we cannot approve the minutes, but are there any changes to the minutes as circulated. I will tell you in advance there was a matter left for a committee on style and it is my understanding that those involved did get together in regard to International Business curriculum. They approved some language that said:

“Because one or more of these courses may not be offered on campus during the two years that a student may be taking major level courses, these courses are most appropriate for study aboard.”

You may remember that discussion from last time. That was language that was agreeable to both the Business School and Professor Lane as I understand it. So that was the resolution of that matter that was left hanging. Also there were one or two minor typographical type changes that we have made. One is the spelling of the Pew Foundation to reflect the proper spelling. Is there anything else that we need to change here?

PROFESSOR FREEMAN HENRY (Languages, Literatures and Cultures) – Please note my presence.

CHAIR WILCOX – We are pleased to have you and make that note. If you did sign the sheet, we should get you. If you did not sign, please be sure you get signed in so we have a record of your attendance at these meetings. If we are missing you, we will need to know that and take better care. Anything else on that. Let me do a quick count of our body here to see where we stand. It looks to me like we are 10 short still, so we will move on to other matters.

II. Reports of Committees.

a. Faculty Senate Steering Committee: Professor Sarah Wise, Secretary: No report.

CHAIR WILCOX – The Curricula and Courses Committee - obviously we cannot vote on any items there until we have a quorum. I am not sure it is worthwhile, but if there is any discussion of the information you have -- particularly with regard to curriculum changes -- then we can discuss those matters; we simply cannot take any action. So if you have something, Professor Blanpied will be happy to help answer them so it will be quicker the next time we have a quorum. Is there anything that anybody is aware of that we need to discuss? Okay. I don't think there is any point in going further.....yes Professor Lane.

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE (Languages, Literatures and Cultures) – Is the effective date of the curriculum change, Fall 2003?

CHAIR WILCOX – Professor Blanpied she asked if the effective date of the curriculum change for Criminal Justice is Fall 2003?

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – I believe so. I do not have those materials with me.

CHAIR WILCOX – He says he believes that is correct. Anything else on that that we would need to know? Are any of the people in the wings senators? You are a senator, okay. Before we go, I will take one more count and see if we can handle that, but at this point we are unable to.

b. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Betty Glad, Chair:

CHAIR WILCOX – Betty Glad I do not believe is here. I will bring you up to speed on the Faculty Advisory Committee. Again they are in the process of considering several matters. One is dealing with the qualifications for being on the Graduate Faculty. I think we have fairly well distilled the issue there. Much of the issue comes from a part of that proposal for Graduate Faculty membership that continuation on the Graduate Faculty would be based in part upon the evaluation in post-tenure review. The committee is concerned that we not turn post tenure-review into a process by which many decisions of the University are made. It is there for a purpose, and I think the sense of the committee is that that is the purpose it ought to be used for and not become a standard by which a lot of other decisions are made. When we get past that hurdle, which I think is doable, they will be ready to come forward with a proposal on that. They are also in the process of reviewing the applicable standards for tenure where colleges are merged or broken apart and how to handle the situations that fall in the transition that occurs. They will be taking up that issue in more detail in the next couple of meetings that they have. Any questions or anything that any one would like to put before Advisory?

c. Faculty Welfare Committee, Peter Graham, Chair:

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – I have a brief report. I would like to reiterate again the flu inoculation program which is ongoing. For those faculty who did contribute to the Family Fund there is no charge. For those who did not there is a \$12 charge it is

available in the Student Health Services, Monday through Thursday, no appointment is needed. We are also looking at a couple other possible programs that we will be subsidizing to help faculty in regards to: wellness works and a couple of other matters we are looking at that we are not ready to announce yet.

I would also like to let you know that that has been some feeling around campus by faculty regarding the new arena in a basketball seating situation. Letters have come to Rob Wilcox, Rob has communicated with the Athletic Director, and the Welfare Committee has communicated with the President. Rob and I met with Chris Massaro from the Athletic Department who heads up that whole area and has to deal with this particular situation. With due respect to the Provost and the President, I think he probably has the toughest job on campus. He does a marvelous job with it. I have known Chris over the years and he has done a spectacular job. We had a meeting with Chris and he explained the rationale of where faculty would be sitting, where donors would be sitting, and where students would be sitting. He had a good rationale for it. We took a tour of the facility and the sightlines are not as bad as they might look if you are looking at the schematics. In fact they are substantially better than one would think. It is a beautiful facility. He has also made the accommodation that he will do two things for faculty if they would like. If they would rather sit on the upper deck, there is one section up there which has a good sightline rather than where the faculty will normally be assigned, they can do that. The other thing he has is for individual games if student tickets have not been picked up by a certain time, faculty can then exchange their tickets for student tickets which might have better sightlines for each specific game. So he is trying to make the accommodations to take care of faculty and to assuage some of discomforts some of the faculty have expressed in terms of where they think they are going to be located.

CHAIR WILCOX – I would add to Peter's comments that one of the things that I am real pleased that they did was that they put students in many of the best seats in the house. And, I honestly think I cannot complain with that. I think those are the people who ought to have the best seats for basketball and football games. The faculty will have basically three sections. One of them is along the ^{side lines} sightlines. Behind the student section is most of one section for faculty. One is in a corner on the lower level and one is ^{side lines} sightlines upper deck. And, what he is willing to do is move you out of the corner lower deck to the ^{side lines} sightlines upper deck if that is what you prefer. And, he will do that on an individual basis. The reality is that to finance the building a certain number of seats downstairs are going to people who give a lot of money to the athletic program. Those decisions were made a long time ago. He is handling tickets within the framework that he has available seats. As Peter said, when you look at the logic he used, it is hard to disagree with the decisions he has made. I am going to be sitting in probably about the worst seats the faculty has, so come up and see me if you don't like your seat. The other thing I will tell you is that, in the corner seats, you are going to be sitting in front of the President because his box is in the corner too. President Sorensen's box, and the Athletic Director's box as well, are both in the corner. They consider the sightlines good enough.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Chris explained it to me.

CHAIR WILCOX – There you go exactly.

PROFESSOR LANE – When I went into talk to Chris, he explained to me that the fact that the number of years holding season tickets has no bearing on the seating. Only date of hire. And, he explained to me that that was the will of the Faculty Welfare Committee. Is that in fact the case?

CHAIR WILCOX – I have not gone back to look for the old minutes. He says there was a resolution from the faculty many years ago, preceding both of our arrivals which was the mid 1980's, that expressed sort of the same view that we have toward parking at the University. That it is the date of hire that decides it. I would say he did actually accommodate in some ways, in some of the decisions he made, the long term ticket holders. As he was going down the court, you start with the center section where the President, the Board have sat for years and you start going down the court sections -- he had choices: Do you favor a few rows further down the court or do you go farther back favoring those who are closer to mid court? One of his views was that people who are longer term ticket holders -- not entirely because some people have stayed where they are -- but by in large -- they are going to be people more mid court, even if a few rows up. So he chose to favor those deeper into a section before moving to the next section down. So he made some decisions, and there are individual exceptions, but that is what he was trying to do there -- was take into account ticket holder longevity a little bit. Yes, he explained to me that if we would like to change our directions to him for the future, he would be happy to accommodate us, but he was operating under what we had told him. Which was news to me as well.

PROFESSOR LANE – Can we send that back to Faculty Welfare for reconsideration?

CHAIR WILCOX – Certainly, Peter can you all discuss whether we want to continue that? Because I think we could send him new directions and they would be perfectly happy to.....

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – I will be happy to bring it up.

CHAIR WILCOX – That is sort of this year's parking issue. We were so frustrated about parking we have turned to basketball tickets. Anything else for Welfare?

d. Committee on Admissions, Professor Don Jones, Chair:

PROFESSOR JONES – The first meeting of the Committee on Admissions will be next Tuesday. President Sorensen has offered to make the same power point presentation for his enrollment management package that he gave before the Board of Trustees. I very much appreciate that. He has a conflict next Tuesday, but he will do it at our next meeting on December 3rd. Of course, the Senate meets on December 4th – so I do not think I can have drafted by the next day the responses and sense of the committee to that presentation. There has been a lot in the print media about it. But I will be pleased at the

February meeting to make a presentation to this body and hope to elicit some additional comments. The President is very interested in having faculty input on his enrollment management package. So you will hear from me at the February meeting, but again, Mr. President, I appreciate your offer.

CHAIR WILCOX – Because of the delay there with the holidays -- we have all read some in the paper about the enrollment management plans -- if you have comments that you would like to make, go ahead and contact Dr. Jones with your comments. I am sure comments could be taken by the committee into their considerations and discussions with the President. So, please do communicate. If you already have thoughts or questions that you would like to have answered, or if you want to make sure that certain things are considered that you are not sure have been on the table, I think if you forward those to Don, he would be sure that the President is aware of your concerns as well. We will take it up in February, but in the interest of time and getting input sooner, I am sure the President would like to hear these things in December as much as he would in February. Feel free to communicate those and we will proceed apace. Any questions on that issue?

e. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor Al Leitch, Chair:

CHAIR WILCOX – The Faculty Budget Committee has no report today. We are essentially waiting for word from the State on what the cuts to the budget will be. I will leave it up to the officers if they wish to talk about the budget situation at this point. From the Faculty Budget Committee not a whole lot has changed since we last met. We were waiting for the elections and, now that they are done, some budget information will start to come relatively quickly, but I will leave it up to the officers if you all wish to discuss that.

f. Other Committees

CHAIR WILCOX – Any other reports of committees? If you will bear with me for a moment. Also, if there is anyone at the Regional Campuses, please do call in and let us know you are there as you count toward the quorum. We may actually be right on it. Is anybody else in the wings a senator? Okay, we are there. That gives us 65 which is my recollection of the count. With that being the case, I am going to go back to Professor Blanpied to make his report now. Thank you all for being here.

g. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Gary Blanpied, Chair:

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – We have two items for your consideration. I. Moore School of Business, the Departments of Accounting and Management Science have changes. It is on page 26.

CHAIR WILCOX – The committee has moved I. Moore School of Business some changes in title and prerequisites, a new course in Accounting. Plus a change in title, prerequisite and description in a course in Management Science. Those have been

moved. Is there any discussion? There being none are you ready to vote? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They are approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – On page 26 through 29, II. College of Liberal Arts the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice there is a change in curriculum.

CHAIR WILCOX – We have a curricula change that is reflecting the movement of Criminal Justice from a separate college to being within the College of Liberal Arts. ^{Our} ~~Are~~ understanding is that this would take affect with the Fall Semester of next year. If there is anybody from that department who knows otherwise, please correct us. Is that correct? Okay that is correct. ^{Roman numeral} ~~It~~ has been moved by the committee. Is there discussion? There being none if we are ready to vote all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. Very good. Thank you.

III. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR WILCOX – Is there a motion to approve the minutes of our October 2nd meeting. Any other changes to make?

PROFESSOR KAYE (Nursing) – There were two of us that were in attendance from the College of Nursing, Dr. Felton and Dr. Kaye.

CHAIR WILCOX - We will add them as attending that meeting. Anything else?

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (Computer Science and Engineering) – Since we are doing attendance, I already exchanged e-mail with Jeanna about this, but I was also in attendance.

CHAIR WILCOX – Is this a case where the sheet got signed and we just didn't pick it up? You are pretty sure you signed it?

JEANNA LUKER (Faculty Senate) – She signed but under the wrong column.

CHAIR WILCOX – Ah, okay. Well anyway we will try to be as observant as we can to get these as we do want to reflect your attendance. Anything else?

PROFESSOR DWIGHT UNDERHILL (Environmental Health) – I was here at the last meeting.

CHAIR WILCOX – And, you are Professor Underhill. Okay, we will add you in as well. A whole column may have gotten out of alignment here. That may be the issue. I will tell you what, if you were here last month, just bring it down to Jeanna and just tell her you were here. The motion will be to approve them with all those changes because apparently it looks like we may have gotten a whole column out of alignment there. Jeanna will add them in. With those changes for attendance is there a motion to approve

the minutes. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. The minutes are approved thank you.

IV. Report of Secretary.

PROFESSOR WISE – No report.

V. Unfinished Business.

None.

VI. New Business.

None.

VII. Reports of Officers.

CHAIR WILCOX – Mr. President.

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN – Thank you very much Professor Wilcox. I welcome the opportunity to be with you again today.

One of the serendipitous benefits of the Bow Tie Bus Tour is that relatively large groups turn out when I give public addresses at Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, Chamber of Commerce meetings, and assemblies in high schools and elementary schools. It is not because I am such a gifted orator, but rather because there is a lot of curiosity about the new President of the University of South Carolina. And, I also think in some of the smaller communities, they look at the entertainment schedule for the day. Where there is not much on the calendar opposite me they think "I'll come and see what he has to say." Then when the word gets out about the size of the audience, politicians show up – especially during election season. So the Bow Tie Bus Tour and the political campaign have been coterminous. Consequently, I have not given a speech in any of these villages, cities, towns, settings where they has not been at least one candidate for office – often many of them. As a result I have gotten to know the candidates better than I would have under normal circumstances. One of the duties of a president of a research university is the morning after the election to get on the phone and start calling the successful candidates and congratulate them on their victories and solicit their support for our university and for higher education. Thus I spent a considerable amount of time this morning doing that and I will be doing more this afternoon. To that end the President's Box at Williams Brice Stadium is also a very popular place on Saturday afternoons when there is a home game. So Mark and Jenny Sanford were there on Saturday, as well as Congressman Henry Brown. On previous games Lindsey Graham and Joe Wilson have been there. Also I have been working for their support prior to the election and now will crank up the volume of assiduous and conscientious placement before them of the needs of the faculty and staff of the University of South Carolina and of the University generally.

I have also extended, particularly to Governor-elect Sanford, the good offices of faculty members at the University of South Carolina, saying that if he needs help with political science or economics or fields that might be of assistance to management during the transition, I was sure we could find faculty who could be of assistance to the transition team. So if he avails himself of that invitation, then I will be calling around to the deans seeing if they can find people who would be interested in assisting in that respect.

I was in Washington yesterday meeting with various elected and appointed officials. One of the most interesting conversations was with Ray Orbach, who is the Director of the Office of Science. He told me something that I found really surprising and I'm embarrassed that I had not known previously. The Office of Science funds 43% of all the governmentally funded research in the physical and biological sciences. I had naively assumed that the National Science Foundation support of those fields would dwarf the support of the Office of Science but the reverse is the case. The National Science Foundation funds 17% of that research nationally. So Ray gave me a list of nine areas that the Office of Science will be focusing on during the next several years. I am sharing those with Dr. Pastides and Dr. Odom, and then they in turn will be responding to the deans of colleges that have faculty in those areas. I also learned that the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts have substantially more funds than in previous years, and I have spoken with Dr. Odom about my hope that more of our faculty will participate in grant proposals - for those of you in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

Ray Orbach was previously the Chancellor of the University of California at Riverside and for several years served on a Committee that I chaired. So we have a friendship that precedes his appointment to this office. He is going to be coming down here in March and I will be announcing his visit and trying to arrange for opportunities for him to meet with faculty who would like to meet with him and discuss current research and proposed research.

I spoke to you at the last meeting about the anticipated cut in the budget up to a 5% cut. I regret to inform you that I have nothing further to report than what I reported at the last meeting. It is not because I have not been diligent in trying to find out more: it is because the politicians have been reluctant to decide when to tell us. So, as Professor Wilcox intimated, I suspect that now that the election is behind us we will learn fairly shortly. I have asked all of the vice presidents to develop a plan in their respective areas to accommodate that 5% cut. Each of the vice presidents is being given precisely the same amount. Obviously for the faculty that is in Provost Odom's domain. So when the precise amount comes out, I will give that number to them and they will determine how they will distribute that cut in their respective domains. They will begin meeting soon to develop that plan.

With respect to enrollment management, I explained to you last time that we have several members of our Board of Trustees who would like to see us substantially increase the size of the incoming freshmen class. By virtue of what happens to cohorts of

freshmen as they come through University, that would mean an increase in the size of the total student body. I have another group of equally vocal trustees who feel we ought to reduce the size of the freshmen class. Having received a fair amount of biblical training in my youth and then in divinity school, I decided to emulate the Old Testament character Solomon. So I carved a via media between each of the extremes and proposed reducing the incoming freshmen class from this year's size of 3,500 – who actually wound up enrolling – to 3,300. That is not cast in concrete, but it seemed to assuage both groups, judging by the conversation in the bus tour throughout New Orleans prior to the LSU game. The Board members and their spouses and my wife and I went out to help coach the football team there. We were not successful on the coaching front but I did have an opportunity to spend considerable amount of time with the members of the Board discussing enrollment management and other issues. However, we will not take a firm stance on that until I have had an opportunity to hear from the faculty and from the Admissions Committee. So I presented it to the Board of Trustees merely as a proposal. I also have to balance the size of the class with the budget. So there is the trade off: if we accept as many students as we did this year, we have to make a substantial amount of money available for adjunct faculty. The preference that Provost Odom and I have is not to add substantial numbers of adjunct faculty. To have the existing faculty accommodate our students is something we desire to have happen. But at the same time, we have to be sensitive to these constant decrements in our budget. If you use tuition revenues to offset some of the decrements, then you have to say to yourself: "What is the cost benefit ratio of scaling up the enrollment and then scaling up the expenditures to accommodate the increase enrollment? Then what if the increase in enrollment causes students to be dissatisfied and unhappy with their experience here?" Then they go home and tell people that it is a terrible place to come – the classes are too crowded, there aren't enough tennis courts, there is not enough parking, and they can't get good seats for the basketball games. So there are such trade offs. It is all a very inexact science, but that is the proposal that I will be presenting to the Admissions Committee. I will be happy to hear from any of you today or on some other occasion your reaction to that.

We have had on the past three days on our campus the NCAA certification team, a decennial requirement for all NCAA member institutions. Our last certification was in 1992. I met with the committee this morning and they discussed their observations. They will be forwarding those to the NCAA. In a few weeks time, the NCAA will send us a draft of those resolutions and recommendations. Then they give us a period of 30 days to respond to their recommendations, and then send it back to them. It is possible that it will be as late as the Spring of 2004 before we would get our final report. As soon as we receive their draft letter, then we will make the results available.

There is an NCAA regulation that the person who serves as the Faculty Athletics Representative must be a faculty member. Susie VanHuss has been serving in that capacity and still is in that capacity until the end of November. She used to be a faculty member but no longer is. Thus I have asked Dr. Russ Pate in the Arnold School of Public Health to serve as our Faculty Athletics Representative and he has agreed. So effective December 1st Dr. Pate will be the Faculty Athletics Representative.

Thank you very much. I am to receive your questions or comments.

CHAIR WILCOX – Are there any questions for the President?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Any reactions to the admissions proposal for the incoming freshmen class? Thank you very much. (Clapping)

CHAIR WILCOX – Thank you very much. Dr. Odom.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM – President Sorensen, I don't have a story like that but I thought that you did tell me that you and the trustees coached the first half of the LSU game and then turned it over to the coaches in the second half.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – A true story.

PROVOST ODOM – I have only two very quick items. I should just follow up on what the President and Rob have said about the budget. As soon as we know what the budget cut is, I will sit down with Rick Kelly and we will try to come up with more than one plan. Then I will meet with the Faculty Budget Committee and we will discuss that with them as we have done unfortunately several times over the past year and half.

We do have a deans search going on right now. We have had one candidate in for the Dean of the Law School. At this particular time we have three additional candidates who are invited who will be in this month and that may or may not be all the candidates that we invite. I will have to discuss that with the search committee but that search is proceeding and we would hope that we could have a dean designate by the end of this calendar year if at all possible.

The other item that I just wanted to report to you is that Dean and Interim Vice President for Research Pastides met with all of the people who had indicated some interest in putting together a proposal for these centers of excellence that will be funded by the lottery. We had twenty-five people, twenty-five titles of proposals that were advanced. We met with those individuals and we did try to impress upon them the fact that one of the criteria was economic development and that would be viewed very strongly by this nine member board that has been appointed at the state level.

The other factor that we are concerned about and will continue to work on is matching funds. There are some members of that board that view that in a fairly broad way and think that matching funds can be funds from the private sector, from foundations, and from the federal government. There are other members of that board who feel like all of that money needs to come from the private sector. There is a subcommittee of the nine member board consisting of Sam Tennebaum, Bill Amick, and Ed McMullen that are meeting tomorrow – that is my understanding – to try to come up with some guidelines for which they will present to full board, which also includes the three presidents of the research universities and I think that meeting is scheduled for November 17th. But all three research universities are lobbying pretty hard to have large

federal grants – not individual grants but large federal grants that are infrastructure building grants - to be able to be used for matching funds. This whole program is to build research centers, to build infrastructure at the universities. So we feel that those kinds of federal funds should be and could be used to accomplish the purpose of the research centers program.

I'll be happy to answer any questions that you have. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WILCOX – Adding on to the President's mention, the NCAA Search Committee did meet with faculty representatives while they were here as well. They were asking various questions and got the faculty perspective on things that were of interest to them.

Is there any other business to come before the body?

VIII. Good of the Order.

None.

IX. Announcements.

CHAIR WILCOX – If there are none is there a motion that we adjourn? All in favor signify by saying aye. You are adjourned and thank you for coming, I appreciate the quorum.